

REMARKS

Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment, claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13-16, and 18-26 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 6, 11, 16, and 21 are amended and new claims 24-26 are added. In view of these amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims pending in the application are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, and 20-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,664,127 issued to Anderson *et al.* ("Anderson"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because Anderson fails to disclose, teach or suggest all of the features of the pending claims.

Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16

Claim 1 as amended recites, *inter alia*, the features of "the table having one or more user selectable table portions" and "a graphics presentation module that presents one or more graphical portions in the graphical user interface, wherein a user assigns the one or more user selectable table portions to at least one of the one or more graphical portions." At least these features are not disclosed, taught or suggested by Anderson.

Apparently, the Examiner relies on col. 8, lines 15-40, and col. 10, lines 14-37 of Anderson to teach these features, which are repeated below for convenience.

Each tab member may include representative indicia, such as textual or graphic labels, including user-selected titles representing the contents of a corresponding page...

The portion of Anderson immediately above this cited portion states:

As shown in FIGS. 2C-E, individual notebook pages are identified by page identifiers 260, preferably located along one edge of the

notebook 250. In a preferred embodiment, each page identifier is in the form of a tab member...

Thus, it appears that Anderson discloses a page identifier for identifying pages and for navigating between pages of a multi-page spreadsheet. These page identifiers are not the same as the Applicants' graphic portions because a user can assign one or more table portions to the Applicants' graphic portions. Apparently, Anderson allows table portions to be entered, cut-and-pasted, copied, etc., into these pages in a conventional manner. The tab members allow the user to navigate these pages either before or after table portions are included therein. This navigation among pages is also conventional. However, these operations are not the same as Applicants' *assigning* a table portion to a graphics portion as set forth in Applicants' specification at, for example, page 6, line 15 through page 7, line 3; page 8, lines 10 through page 9, line 2; and page 9, lines 9-18 of the specification. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Anderson does not disclose, teach or suggest this feature of claim 1.

Furthermore, Col. 10, lines 14-37 states:

Employing the user-specified page identifiers of the present invention, a simple nomenclature is available for specifying these solid blocks of information...

...For example, a solid block may be defined as A...D:A1...C4, in which case the block spans from cells A1 to C4, and spans across Pages A-D. By permitting alias names (i.e., user-supplied alternative labels), the present invention allows the block to be specified as 1989 Sales...1992 Sales:A1...C4...

Thus, it appears that Anderson discloses enabling a user to label the tab members associated with each page. One skilled in the art would not equate labeling a page in the manner set forth by Anderson with assigning a table portion to a graphics portion as recited in claim 1. Thus, for at least this additional reason, Anderson does not disclose, teach or suggest the features of claim 1.

In addition, the Examiner asserts that the "graphical portion" feature of claim 1 can be interpreted as any portion of the spreadsheet, which can be

selectively assigned to a selected portion of a table by dragging the selected portion of the table to the graphical portion. See Page 2 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully disagree. As set forth in the Applicants' specification, the "graphics portion" may include, for example, a tab, a button, an icon, etc. See, e.g., page 5, lines 1-2. Thus, as defined by Applicants, graphics portion can not be interpreted as any portion of the table. Therefore, the Examiner's interpretation of graphical portion being any portion of the table is improper.

Furthermore, the Examiner in his arguments relies on dragging and dropping a selected portion of the table to his so-called "graphics portions" which are more appropriately described as other table portions. However, the dragging and dropping of a selected table portion is not the same as Applicants' assigning a selected table portion as set forth in the specification. Moreover, dragging and dropping to another table portion is clearly not equivalent to the assigning to a graphics portion as set forth in claim 1. Thus, for at least this additional reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Anderson does not disclose, teach or suggest the features of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw his rejection of claim 1 based on Anderson.

Claims 6, 11, and 16 recite features similar to those recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that these claims are also patentable over Anderson for at least the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Claim 21

Claim 21 as amended recites, *inter alia*, the features of "the table having one or more user selectable table portions" and "enabling a user to assign a user-selectable graphics portion to the selected one or more of the table portions." At least these features are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Anderson.

Apparently, the Examiner again relies on col. 8, lines 15-40, and col. 10, lines 14-37 of Anderson to teach these features of claim 21. As set forth above, Anderson apparently discloses a page identifier for identifying pages and for navigating between pages of a multi-page spreadsheet in a conventional

manner. However, these operations are not the same as Applicants' *assigning* a graphics portion to a table portion as set forth in Applicants' specification at, for example, page 9, lines 9-18 of the specification. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Anderson does not disclose, teach or suggest this feature of claim 21.

Apparently, Anderson allows table portions to be entered, cut-and-pasted, copied, etc., into these pages in a conventional manner. The tab members allow the user to navigate these pages either before or after table portions are included therein. This navigation among pages is also conventional. However, these operations are not the same as Applicants' *assigning* a graphic portion to a table portion as set forth in the specification. See e.g., page 9, lines 9-18 of the specification.

Furthermore, as discussed above, the disclosure in Anderson of enabling a user to label tab members associated with each page is not the same as Applicants' assigning a graphics portion to a table portion. One skilled in the art would simply not equate labeling a page with assigning a graphics portion to a table portion. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Anderson does not disclose, teach or suggest the features of claim 21.

The Examiner again asserts that the "graphical portion" feature of claim 21 can be interpreted as any portion of the spreadsheet, which can be selectively assigned to a selected portion of a table by dragging the selected portion of the table to the graphical portion. Applicants respectfully disagree. As set forth in the Applicants' specification, the "graphics portion" may include, for example, a tab, a button, an icon, etc. See, e.g., page 5, lines 1-2. Thus, as defined by Applicants, graphics portion can not be interpreted as any portion of the table. Therefore, the Examiner's interpretation of graphical portion being any portion of the table is improper.

Furthermore, the Examiner in his arguments relies on dragging and dropping a selected portion of the table to his so-called "graphics portions" which are more appropriately described as other table portions. However, the dragging

and dropping of a selected table portion is not the same as Applicants' assigning a graphics portion to a selected table portion as set forth in the specification. Moreover, dragging and dropping to another table portion is clearly not equivalent to the assigning a graphics portion as set forth in claim 21. Thus, for at least this additional reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Anderson does not disclose, teach or suggest the features of claim 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw his rejection of claim 21 based on Anderson.

Claim 24

Claim 24 recites, *inter alia*, the features of "enabling a user to assign a user-selectable graphics portion to the selected one or more of the table portions" and "the user selectable graphics portion is other than the tabs for navigating among the one or more sheets." At least these features are not disclosed, taught or suggested by Anderson.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention includes tabs as well as graphical portions in a table, where the tabs are used for navigating among sheets of the table and the graphical portions are used for presenting table portions that are assigned to the graphical portions. Anderson discloses tabs for navigation among sheets. However, Anderson does not disclose, teach, or suggest graphical portions as set forth in claim 24. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 24 is patentable over Anderson.

Claim 25

Claim 25 recites, *inter alia*, the features of "enabling a user to select two or more discontinuous table portions" and "enabling a user to assign a user-selectable graphics portion to the selected two or more of the discontinuous table portions." At least these features are not disclosed, taught or suggested by Anderson.

Applicants respectfully submit that Anderson discloses a page identifier for identifying pages and navigating between pages of a multi-page spreadsheet. These page identifiers are not the same as the Applicants' graphic portions that

can be assigned by a user to discontinuous table portions. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Anderson does not disclose, teach or suggest a graphics portion as set forth in claim 25. Furthermore, Anderson does not disclose, teach or suggest enabling a user to select discontinuous table portions and assign a graphics portion to the selected discontinuous table portions, where the graphics portion can later be selected to present the selected discontinuous table portions. For at least these foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 25 is patentable over Anderson.

Claim 26

Claim 26 recites, *inter alia*, the features of “the table including a plurality of table portions on a single sheet,” “enabling a user to select two or more discontinuous table portions of the plurality of table portions on the single sheet” and “enabling a user to assign a user-selectable graphics portions to the selected two or more of the discontinuous table portions.” At least these features are not disclosed, taught or suggested by Anderson.

Applicants respectfully submit that Anderson discloses a page identifier for identifying pages and navigating between pages of a multi-page spreadsheet. As set forth above, these page identifiers are not the same as the Applicants’ graphic portions that can be assigned by a user to discontinuous table portions. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Anderson does not disclose, teach or suggest a graphics portion as set forth in claim 26.

Additionally, the invention as set forth in claim 26 includes a table on a single sheet. A user can select the discontinuous portions of this single sheet table and assign a graphics portion to them. Applicants respectfully submit that Anderson does not disclose, teach, or suggest enabling a user to select discontinuous table portions of a single sheet table and assign a graphics portion to the selected discontinuous table portions, where the graphics portion can later be selected to present the selected discontinuous table portions. For at least these foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 26 is patentable over Anderson.

Claims 3, 5, 8, 10, 13, 15, 18, 20, 22, and 23

Claims 3, 5, 8, 10, 13-15, 18-20, 22, and 23 depend from and add additional features to one of independent claims 1, 6, 11, 16, and 21. Because Anderson does not disclose, teach or suggest each of the features recited in the independent claims, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 3, 5, 8, 10, 13, 15, 18, 20, 22, and 23 are also patentable for at least the foregoing reasons.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such disposition is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference or interview would advance prosecution of this application in any manner, the undersigned stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,
Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris Glovsky and Popeo, PC

Dated: May 28, 2003

Respectfully submitted,



29315

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Rick A. Toering
Registration No.: 43,195
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND
POPEO P.C.
12010 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 900
Reston, Virginia 20190
703-464-4806